DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 209 374 UD 021 725

AUTHOR Ramey, Madelaine; James, Jim
TITLE An Assessment of the Impact of Special Education Programs on Non-Special Education School Building Staff. Report No. 77-13.
INSTITUTION Seattle Public Schools, Wash. Dept. of Management Information Services.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Aug 77
NOTE 29p.; Some tables may be marginally legible due to small size type. For a related document, see UD 021 724.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Expenditure Per Student; *Mainstreaming; *Program Costs; Readiness; *Special Education; *Staff Development; Teacher Qualifications
IDENTIFIERS *Seattle Public Schools WA

ABSTRACT

This report assesses the impact of special education programs on non-special education school building staff in Seattle, Washington, during the 1976-1977 school year. The report presents the results of a survey that was designed to investigate two questions: (1) to what extent does the presence of a special education program result in expenditures of non-special education staff time; and (2) what is the state of readiness for bringing more special education students into the regular classroom? It is recommended that the calculation of cost per pupil for special education include the costs of services delivered by other personnel. Also called for is the initiation of an inservice training program for non-special education staff to teach handicapped students in the regular classroom. (APM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
DAVID G. Colwell Jr.
Seattle Public Schools

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS ON NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION SCHOOL BUILDING STAFF

REPORT NO. 77-13
AUGUST 1977

MADELAINE RAMEY
JIM JAMES

Office of
Instructional Program Evaluation

Department of
Management Information Services

SEATTLE
PUBLIC
SCHOOLS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to thank the many counselors, nurses, principals, secretaries, and teachers who took the time to complete the questionnaire on which this study is based. Thanks are also due to Mike Ragghianti, Cheri Stein and Fern Weston whose help made this report possible.

This study was funded in part under Title VI, Part B, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Administrative and Service Center
815 Fourth Avenue North
Seattle, Washington 98109

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS ON NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION SCHOOL BUILDING STAFF

REPORT NO. 77-13
AUGUST 1977

MADELAINE RAMEY
JIM JAMES

MANAGEMENT SERVICES DIVISION
Robert L. Nelson
Assistant Superintendent

MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SERVICES DEPARTMENT
Susan Stier, Director

OFFICE OF INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM EVALUATION
David G. Colwell, Jr., Supervisor

Prepared by:

Madelaine Ramey
Madelaine Ramey
Evaluator II

Jim James
Jim James
Planner/Evaluator

Approved by:

David G. Colwell, Jr.
David G. Colwell, Jr.
Supervisor

Susan Stier
Susan Stier
Director

ABSTRACT

An Assessment of the Impact of Special Education Programs on Non-Special Education School Building Staff, Report 77-13, analyzes questionnaire responses of non-Special Education school building personnel who were surveyed during the 1976-77 school year.

The survey was designed to elicit information on two major questions. First, to what extent does the presence of a Special Education program result in expenditures of non-Special Education staff time? Second, what is the state of readiness for bringing more Special Education students into the regular classroom?

Two recommendations were suggested based on an analysis of survey questionnaire responses:

1. Since the cost of services delivered by non-Special Education personnel to Special Education students has previously been overlooked in calculating cost per pupil per year for Special Education, it is recommended that in the future such costs be included in calculating the cost per pupil.

2. Because of non-Special Education teachers' self-professed lack of experience and qualifications to teach Special Education students, it is recommended that an inservice training program be initiated to prepare non-Special Education teachers for teaching handicapped students in the regular classroom. Such a program would provide teacher preparation for eventual mainstreaming of Special Education students.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE AND PROCEDURES	3
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	5
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	9
APPENDIX A	11
APPENDIX B	21

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
TABLE 1:	AVERAGE NUMBER OF HOURS PER MONTH SPENT ON SPECIAL EDUCATION RELATED ACTIVITIES BY SELECTED NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION STAFF AT SCHOOLS HOUSING SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS	11
TABLE 2:	AVERAGE NUMBER OF HOURS PER MONTH SPENT ON SPECIAL EDUCATION RELATED ACTIVITIES BY SELECTED NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION STAFF WITHIN AND ACROSS GRADE LEVELS	12
TABLE 3:	COST OF SPECIAL EDUCATION RELATED ACTIVITIES FOR SELECTED NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION SCHOOL BUILDING STAFF	13
TABLE 4:	PROBLEMS PERCEIVED BY SELECTED NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION STAFF AS ARISING FROM THE PRESENCE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS AT A SCHOOL	14
TABLE 5:	EXTENT TO WHICH SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS MIX FORMALLY WITH OTHER STUDENTS AS PERCEIVED BY SELECTED NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION STAFF WITHIN AND ACROSS GRADE LEVELS	15
TABLE 6:	EXTENT TO WHICH SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS MIX INFORMALLY WITH OTHER STUDENTS AS PERCEIVED BY SELECTED NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION STAFF WITHIN AND ACROSS GRADE LEVELS	16
TABLE 7:	NUMBER OF SELECTED NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION STAFF WHO HAVE HAD SELECTED KINDS OF EXPERIENCE WITH SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS	17
TABLE 8:	NUMBER OF NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS WHO HAVE HAD SELECTED KINDS OF EXPERIENCE WITH SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS BY TYPE OF HANDICAP SERVED	18
TABLE 9:	NUMBER OF NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS WHO FEEL QUALIFIED TO TEACH SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS BY HANDICAP OF STUDENT AND BY GRADE LEVEL TAUGHT	19
TABLE 10:	NUMBER OF NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS WHO FEEL QUALIFIED TO COUNSEL SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS BY HANDICAP OF STUDENT	20

INTRODUCTION

Of the approximately 3,000 handicapped students enrolled in Seattle Public Schools, over 90% attend classes in buildings where the majority of students and staff have no direct organizational or fiscal relationship to Special Education.

Based upon proximity of Special Education classrooms and the normal day-to-day activities of school building operation, it seems intuitively reasonable to expect certain demands on the work time of non-Special Education personnel. However, no systematic effort has previously been made to document the extent of such time demands. Such information is important for planning of building staffing as well as for understanding the full cost of Special Education programs.

Part of the present study, conducted at the request of the Instructional Services Division, provides estimates of these time demands and their dollar costs.

A second focus of the study deals with the perceived experience, qualifications and needs of non-Special Education building staff related to teaching handicapped students. Such information has important implications for the increased mainstreaming efforts required by PL 94-142 and related Federal legislation.

Overview

The remaining sections of the report include a Procedures section which describes methods used for data gathering and analysis, a Results section which interprets the findings of the study and a Summary and Recommendations section which offers some possible courses of action pursuant to needs identified in earlier sections.

PURPOSE AND PROCEDURE

The present study, performed at the request of the District's Instructional Services Division, was addressed to two major concerns: to assess the extent to which the presence of a Special Education program results in expenditures of non-Special Education staff time; to assess non-Special Education teachers' experience in and self-perceived qualifications for dealing with Special Education students. The second concern was related to the potential for "mainstreaming" or bringing more Special Education students into the regular classroom.

The data necessary to address these two concerns were obtained through a questionnaire (see Appendix B) sent to counselors, nurses, principals, secretaries, and non-Special Education teachers at a sample of schools that house Special Education programs. Forty-nine out of sixty-three schools were sampled: eleven senior high, eleven junior high and middle, and twenty-seven elementary schools. Pacific School was omitted since all of its student body is in Special Education. Completed questionnaires were received from 31 counselors, 36 nurses, 34 principals, 36 secretaries, and 178 teachers, yielding return rates of 63%, 73%, 69%, 73%, and 61%, respectively. Overall, 315 or 64% of the original sample returned completed questionnaires.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter is divided into two major sections, corresponding to the two concerns outlined in the Purpose and Procedures chapter.

Impact on a School Building of the Presence of Special Education Programs

Time spent by non-Special Education staff. Table 1 (Appendix A) gives the average number of hours per month spent on Special Education related activities by selected non-Special Education staff at schools housing Special Education programs. Inspection of Table 1 indicates that the greatest amount of time of staff members is spent on paper work related to Special Education students. Within staff categories, secretaries and counselors spend the most and second most amount of time on paper work. Also of note is the average amount of time (12.1 hours per month) spent by principals disciplining Special Education students. A considerable amount of time is spent counseling Special Education students, not just by counselors but by other non-Special Education staff as well.

The "other" activities varied according to staff category. Among the other activities mentioned by counselors, conferring with Special Education teachers was mentioned most often. Other activities mentioned by nurses were in order of frequency: first aid and health checks, health education teaching, conferring with Special Education teachers, and contacting medical agencies. For principals, other activities mentioned most often were building staff conferences, visits, and supervision. For secretaries, other activities, in order of frequency mentioned, were office assistance, phone calls, and first aid. For non-Special Education teachers, the ordered list of other activities is: contact classroom instruction, conferring with Special Education teachers, supervision, and library classes.

Time spent by grade level. When the average number of hours per month spent on Special Education related activities is distributed by grade level, as in Table 2 (Appendix A), there are some noteworthy findings. More time is spent on counseling, parent conferences, paper work, and dealing with Special Education administration at the junior high and middle school level than at either the senior high or elementary school levels. On the other hand, more time is spent on discipline at the elementary level than at either the senior high or junior high/middle school levels. Overall, time expenditure is lowest at the senior high level and highest at the junior high/middle school level.

Time spent by handicap program. It was not possible to obtain a direct assessment of time spent on each handicap program. However, time spent per month on Special Education related activities by non-Special Education staff was available by school. An indirect measure of time spent by handicap was obtained by totalling the hours spent at all schools housing a given handicap

program. Thus, if a school houses more than one program, its hours would be reflected in each program's total. Allowing for the inaccuracy introduced by this method of calculation, it did seem that the time spent per month on activities related to the Behaviorally Disabled is disproportionately large, considering the number of students placed in this category. It appears that Behaviorally Disabled students do require a relatively greater expenditure of time than do students placed in other categories.

Relationship between hours spent and percentage of Special Education enrollment. In order to investigate the relationship between average number of hours spent in Special Education related activities and percent of a school's total enrollment comprised of Special Education students,* the correlation between these two variables was calculated. The obtained correlation was .46, which is indicative of a moderate but not strong relationship. The same correlations computed separately for high schools, junior high/middle schools and elementary schools were -.23, .35 and .51 respectively, indicating that the relationship exists primarily at the elementary level. Thus it appears that factors other than the percentage of Special Education students account for the amount of time spent on Special Education related activities at a given school. As was noted earlier, one of these factors appears to be the type of handicap program(s) housed at the school.

Cost. In Table 3 (Appendix A), the cost per year of Special Education related activites for selected non-Special Education building staff is estimated. The method used to calculate the estimates is described in the footnote to Table 3. It should be reiterated, however, that due to the method of calculation the cost figures given in row (6) of Table 3 are quite conservative. Thus referring to Table 3, it may be concluded with considerable confidence that the total cost per year, in terms of 1976-77 non-Special Education staff salaries, was at least $2,518,283. Since these non-Special Education incurred costs are not used in calculating the cost per Special Education student per year, these represent "hidden overhead" costs of maintaining Special Education programs. It should be pointed out that these costs represent a direct District contribution to the maintenance of Special Education which is not normally reflected in budget presentations. The magnitude of such hidden costs is indeed noteworthy.

Problems arising from the presence of Special Education programs. Table 4 (Appendix A) lists the problems arising from the presence of Special Education students at a school. The problems indicated are listed below in order of the frequency with which they were mentioned.

*The percent of Special Education enrollment at each school was obtained from the District's 1976-77 Racial Distribution of Students and Staff, Vol. I: Students.

No problems

Discipline, disruptive behavior

Lack of acceptance by other students/integration

Not enough administrative, teacher, counselor, and/or nurse time for needs

Not enough support personnel

Lack of facilities, space, supplies

Lack of understanding, compassion

Classes are too large

Requires additional paper work

Poor placement procedures

Not enough communication between regular and Special Education teachers

Although many non-Special Education personnel saw no problems, many others indicated that there are problems associated with the presence of Special Education students at a school. The range of type of problem mentioned is considerable, as is evident from the above list.

Extent to which Special Education students mix with other students. In order to determine the extent to which Special Education students currently have contact with other students at their schools, respondents were asked, "...to what extent do Special Education students mix with other students at your school?" Respondents were to answer twice, once for "formal" mixing (in assemblies, field trips, extra-curricular activities) and once for "informal" mixing (during recess, lunch, coming to and from school). The responses were broken down by grade level and summarized in Tables 5 and 6 (Appendix A). Comparing Tables 5 and 6, there does not appear to be a very large difference in the extent to which Special Education students mix formally and informally with other students; however, there is some variation among grade levels. Most mixing, both formal and informal, occurs among students at the junior high and middle school level, with 26.2% of the respondents reporting "a lot" of informal mixing; next most mixing occurs among students at the elementary level; and the least amount of mixing occurs among students at the senior high level.

Teachers' Experience and Qualifications

Experience. Table 7 (Appendix A) gives the number of selected non-Special Education staff who have had selected kinds of experience with Special Education students. Of particular interest is the teacher experience. From Table 7, it can be seen that many (113 or 69.3% of the teacher-respondents) have taught Special Education students in a regular classroom. Likewise, many (106 or 65% of the teacher-respondents) have referred students for Special

Education services and somewhat fewer (97 or 59.5%) have disciplined Special Education students.

Referring to Table 8 (Appendix A), it is possible to examine the types of handicap involved in these teacher experiences. Of those teachers who have taught Special Education students in a regular classroom, 37 (32.7%) have taught the Learning/Language Disabled, 28 (24.8%) have taught the Behaviorally Disabled, and 28 (24.8%) have taught the Mildly Mentally Retarded. To a lesser extent, non-Special Education teachers have taught the physically handicapped: 18 (15.9%) have taught the Hearing Impaired and 12 (10.6%) have taught the Visually Impaired. Of those teachers who have disciplined Special Education students, the largest number (29 or 29.9%) have disciplined Behaviorally Disabled students. Thus it appears that some non-Special Education teachers have already had some experience with Special Education students in all handicap categories. However, the percentages given above were obtained from a sample of non-Special Education teachers at schools housing Special Education programs. The percentages most likely would be lower for non-Special Education teachers in general, since that population includes teachers who may never have been in contact with Special Education students.

It is interesting to note that some (29 or 17.8%) non-Special Education teachers have taught Special Education classes. The number who have done so varies among grade levels; 3 (7.7%) at the senior high level, 3 (8.6%) at the junior high/middle school level, and 23 (25.8%) at the elementary level. Since relatively more elementary level teachers have had the experience of teaching Special Education classes, it would seem that the greatest teacher preparation for mainstreaming will be needed at the senior high and junior high/middle school levels.

Qualifications. Non-Special Education teachers were asked what handicap categories they feel qualified to teach. The results are summarized in Table 9 (Appendix A). The largest number (82 or 60.3%) indicated the Mildly Mentally Retarded. From Table 9 it can be seen that there is some variation among grade levels in the frequency with which teachers indicate that they feel qualified to teach the Mildly Mentally Retarded; 17 (54.8%) senior high teachers, 25 (75.8%) junior high/middle teachers, and 40 (55.6%) elementary teachers indicate that they feel qualified to teach the Mildly Mentally Retarded.

The second largest number (58 or 43.3%) of teachers indicated that they feel qualified to teach the Learning/Language Disabled. Only 3 (2.2%) felt qualified to teach the Severely Mentally Retarded. There was little variation by grade level in the frequency with which teachers indicated that they feel qualified to teach students with these latter two handicaps.

When non-Special Education teachers were asked what handicap categories they feel qualified to counsel, the results shown in Table 10 (Appendix A) were obtained. For each handicap the numbers in Table 10 are smaller than those in Table 9, indicating that teachers feel less qualified to counsel than to teach each handicap category. Taken together, Tables 9 and 10 indicate that, from the standpoint of a mainstreaming potential, non-Special Education teachers will require more extensive preparation than they have at present.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was twofold: first, to assess the impact on a school building of housing a Special Education program or programs; second, to describe the non-Special Education teacher readiness for bringing more Special Education students into the regular classroom. These two concerns were addressed by means of a questionnaire sent to various non-Special Education school building personnel.

Impact

Time spent. The largest amount of time expended by non-Special Education staff on Special Education related activities was spent on paper work, particularly by secretaries and counselors. However, the amount of time spent by principals on discipline of Special Education students is also considerable.

More time is spent on counseling, parent conferences, paper work, and dealing with Special Education administration at the junior high and middle school level than at either the senior high or elementary school levels. However, the amount of time spent on discipline is greatest at the elementary level. Overall, the projected non-Special Education staff time expended in the course of a single school year on Special Education related activity is approximately 140 person years (180-day school years).

The handicap category which appears to require the greatest expenditure of time, proportionate to the number of students, is the Behaviorally Disabled category.

Relationship between time expenditure and percentage of Special Education enrollment. At the elementary level, but not at the junior and senior high levels, there is a moderate relationship between number of hours spent on Special Education related activities and the percent Special Education enrollment at a school. Thus it appears that factors other than the percentage of Special Education students account for the amount of time spent on Special Education related activities at a given school. As noted above, one such factor appears to be the type of handicap program(s) housed at the school.

Cost. The estimated cost per year of Special Education related activities for selected non-Special Education building staff was calculated. A conservative estimate of the total of such costs was found to be $2,518,283, based on 1976-77 salaries. Since this non-Special Education incurred cost is not used in calculating the cost per pupil per year for Special Education, cost per pupil figures are actually under-estimates of real cost.

Recommendation. It is recommended that the cost of services provided to Special Education students by regular school building personnel be routinely included in calculating the cost per pupil for Special Education in all pertinent budget and accounting activities.

Problems. Selected non-Special Education school building personnel were asked what problems arise from the presence of Special Education students at their school. Heading the list of most frequently mentioned problems were:

1. Discipline, disruptive behavior
2. Lack of acceptance and integration
3. Not enough administrative, teacher, counselor, and/or nurse time for needs

Anticipating the second most frequently mentioned problem, respondents were also asked on the survey questionnaire to what extent Special Education students mix with other students. The most amount of mixing was reported as occurring at the junior high and middle school level, while the least amount was reported as occurring at the senior high level.

Teacher Experience and Qualifications

Although many non-Special Education teachers have had experience in teaching Special Education students with a variety of handicaps, a good number have not. Moreover, a large number of non-Special Education teachers indicated that they did not feel qualified to teach or counsel other than the Mildly Mentally Retarded. Since it is to be expected that other mildly handicapped students will be brought in increasing numbers into the regular classroom, it appears that more extensive non-Special Education teacher preparation for this eventuality will be required.

Recommendation. It is recommended that an inservice training program be initiated to prepare non-Special Education teachers for teaching handicapped students in the regular classroom. To the extent that large scale mainstreaming becomes a reality, such a program might include the use of experienced Special Education teachers as itinerant trainers and resource people for the regular classroom teachers.

TABLE 1

AVERAGE NUMBER OF HOURS PER MONTH SPENT ON SPECIAL EDUCATION RELATED ACTIVITIES BY SELECTED NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION STAFF AT SCHOOLS HOUSING SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS (MAY 1977)

Activity	Staff					Staff Average*
	Counselors	Nurses	Principals	Secretaries	Non-Special Education Teachers	
iscipline	2.4	1.1	12.1	4.8	2.3	3.8
unseling	11.0	6.6	7.8	1.5	2.4	4.6
rent Conferences	2.9	4.3	3.3	0.3	0.5	1.7
per Work	6.8	4.3	4.4	13.8	4.1	5.7
aling with Special ucation Administration	4.8	2.4	5.3	4.0	0.9	2.5
her Activities	3.8	6.8	8.7	3.2	2.8	4.4
tal Hours	31.7	25.5	41.6	27.6	13.0	22.7

*The staff average was computed by weighting the average number of hours spent by individuals in a staff category by the number of respondents in that category, summing the weighted averages, and dividing by the total number of respondents.

TABLE 2

AVERAGE NUMBER OF HOURS PER MONTH SPENT ON SPECIAL EDUCATION RELATED ACTIVITIES BY SELECTED NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION STAFF WITHIN AND ACROSS GRADE LEVELS (MAY 1977)

Activity	Grade Level			Average Across Grade Levels*
	Senior	Junior High and Middle	Elementary	
Discipline	2.6	2.6	4.9	3.8
Counseling	4.8	7.6	3.1	4.6
Parent Conferences	1.4	2.5	1.5	1.7
Paper Work	5.5	7.2	5.1	5.7
Dealing with Special Education Administration	2.6	3.5	2.1	2.5
Other Activities	3.0	4.9	4.9	4.4
Total Hours	19.9	28.3	21.6	22.7

*The average across grade levels was computed by weighting the average number of hours spent within a grade level by the number of respondents at that level, summing the weighted averages, and dividing by the total number of respondents.

TABLE 3

COST OF SPECIAL EDUCATION RELATED ACTIVITIES FOR SELECTED NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION SCHOOL BUILDING STAFF
(MAY 1977)

	Staff					Total
	Counselors	Nurses	Principals	Secretaries	Non-Special Education Teachers	
(1) Average number of hours spent per month	31.7	25.5	35.3*	17.0*	9.5*	
(2) Projected number of persons**	23***	36***	63	63	1,843	
(3) Total projected hours per month (1) X (2)	729.1	918.0	2,223.9	1,071.0	17,508.5	
(4) Person years equivalent [(3) X 9 mos/8 hrs ÷ 180 days]	4.6	5.7	13.9	6.7	109.4	140.3
(5) Average Annual Salary****	$19,387	$17,092	$28,192	$11,011	$17,057	
(6) Cost per year (4) X (5)	$89,180	$97,424	$391,869	$73,774	$1,866,036	$2,518,283

*Because the number of respondents was small relative to the population size, an estimate of the population average number of hours spent was obtained by finding the lower bound of a 95% confidence interval for that population value. The bounds of a 95% confidence interval are such that, in repeated samplings, 95% of the time they will contain the population value. The effect of this adjustment is to project cost figures in (6) that are conservative in terms of the actual cost.

**Projections were made to the number of selected staff at all schools (63) housing Special Education programs.

***Projections were not made for counselors and nurses because these persons serve more than one school. Only those counselors and nurses responding to the questionnaire were counted. Thus the cost figures in (6) for counselors and nurses may be underestimates.

****For 1976-77, obtained from the Salary Administration Office. The average annual salary for secretaries was obtained from the Supervisor, Classified Employee Services.

TABLE 4

PROBLEMS PERCEIVED BY SELECTED NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION STAFF AS ARISING FROM THE PRESENCE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS AT A SCHOOL*
(MAY 1977)

	Staff					Total Staff
	Counselors	Nurses	Principals	Secretaries	Non-Special Education Teachers	
No problems	5	5	7	7	52	76
Discipline, disruptive behavior	2	4	10	10	39	65
Lack of acceptance by other students/ integration	2	11	4	3	41	61
Not enough administrative, teacher, counselor and/or nurse time for needs	9	12	13	1	23	58
Not enough support personnel	7	5	5	--	7	24
Lack of facilities, space, supplies	1	2	5	1	7	16
Lack of understanding, compassion	4	2	2	2	5	15
Classes are too large	1	--	--	1	11	13
Requires additional paper work	1	1	2	2	2	8
Poor placement procedures	2	1	--	--	1	4
Not enough communication between regular and Special Education teachers	--	--	--	--	4	4

*Numbers in table are numbers of staff indicating each problem.

TABLE 5

EXTENT TO WHICH SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS MIX FORMALLY* WITH OTHER STUDENTS AS PERCEIVED BY SELECTED NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION STAFF WITHIN AND ACROSS GRADE LEVELS (MAY 1977)

Extent	Grade Level			Total Staff
	Senior	Junior High and Middle	Elementary	
A Lot	10 (14.3)	16 (24.6)	31 (20.1)	57 (19.7)
A Moderate Amount	34 (48.6)	28 (43.1)	67 (43.5)	129 (44.6)
Very Little	24 (34.3)	19 (29.2)	51 (33.1)	94 (32.5)
Not At All	2 (2.9)	2 (3.1)	5 (3.2)	9 (3.1)

*For example, in assemblies, field trips, extra-curricular activities.

Note: Unenclosed numbers are raw frequencies; numbers in parentheses are within-column percentages.

TABLE 6

EXTENT TO WHICH SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS MIX INFORMALLY* WITH OTHER STUDENTS AS PERCEIVED BY SELECTED NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION STAFF WITHIN AND ACROSS GRADE LEVELS (MAY 1977)

Extent	Grade Level			Total Staff
	Senior	Junior High and Middle	Elementary	
A Lot	8 (11.0)	17 (26.2)	28 (18.1)	53 (18.1)
A Moderate Amount	40 (54.8)	31 (47.7)	70 (45.2)	141 (48.1)
Very Little	24 (32.9)	16 (24.6)	51 (32.9)	91 (31.1)
Not At All	1 (1.4)	1 (1.5)	6 (3.9)	8 (2.7)

*For example, during recess, lunch, coming to and from school.

Note: Unenclosed numbers are raw frequencies; numbers in parentheses are within-column percentages.

TABLE 7

NUMBER OF SELECTED NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION STAFF WHO HAVE HAD SELECTED KINDS OF EXPERIENCE WITH SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS
(MAY 1977)

Experience	Staff					Total Staff
	Counselors	Nurses	Principals	Secretaries	Non-Special Education Teachers	
Have taught Special Education classes	5* (20.0)	12** (33.3)	5 (16.2)	0 (0.0)	29 (17.8)	51 (18.8)
Have taught Special Education students in a regular classroom	11 (44.0)	6 (16.7)	7 (21.2)	1 (6.7)	113 (69.3)	138 (50.7)
Have referred students for Special Education services	23 (92.0)	30 (83.3)	23 (69.7)	5 (33.3)	106 (65.0)	187 (68.8)
Have counseled Special Education students	23 (92.0)	33 (91.7)	25 (78.1)	5 (33.3)	46 (28.2)	132 (48.7)
Have conferred with parents of Special Education students	22 (88.0)	33 (91.7)	27 (81.8)	8 (53.3)	54 (33.1)	144 (52.9)
Have disciplined Special Education students	12 (48.0)	10 (27.8)	29 (87.9)	8 (53.3)	97 (59.5)	156 (57.4)
Have conducted extra-curricular activities which included Special Education students	13 (52.0)	13 (36.1)	18 (54.5)	1 (6.7)	30 (18.4)	75 (27.6)

*The data gave no indication as to what counselors taught in Special Education classes.

**Provision of Health Education instruction.

Note: Unenclosed numbers are raw frequencies; numbers in parentheses are percentages within each staff category who indicated having had a given kind of experience.

TABLE 8

NUMBER OF NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS WHO HAVE HAD SELECTED KINDS OF EXPERIENCE WITH SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS BY TYPE OF HANDICAP SERVED (MAY 1977)

	Handicap						
	Visually Impaired	Hearing Impaired	Ortho-pedically Impaired	Neuro-logically Impaired	Mentally Retarded	Behav-iorally Disabled	Learning/ Language Disabled
Have taught Special Education classes	1 (0 6)	2 (1.2)	1 (0.6)	1 (0.6)	14 (8.6)	4 (2.5)	7 (4.3)
Have taught Special Education students in a regular classroom	12 (7.4)	18 (11.0)	9 (5.5)	9 (5.5)	28 (17.2)	28 (17.2)	37 (22.7)
Have counseled Special Education students	8 (4.9)	3 (1.8)	6 (3.7)	6 (3.7)	9 (5.5)	15 (9.2)	18 (11.0)
Have conferred with parents of Special Education students	5 (3.1)	7 (4.3)	6 (3.7)	8 (4.9)	12 (7.4)	14 (8.6)	16 (9.8)
Have disciplined Special Education students	6 (3.7)	7 (4.3)	4 (2.5)	8 (4.9)	23 (14.1)	29 (17.8)	24 (14.7)
Have conducted extra-curricular activities which included Special Education students	1 (0.6)	3 (1.8)	2 (1.2)	3 (1.8)	4 (2.5)	3 (1.8)	6 (3.7)

Note: Numbers in parentheses are percentages of all teachers responding.

TABLE 9

NUMBER OF NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS WHO FEEL QUALIFIED TO TEACH SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS BY HANDICAP OF STUDENT AND BY GRADE LEVEL TAUGHT
(MAY 1977)

Handicap	Grade Level			Total
	Senior	Junior High and Middle	Elementary	
Visually Impaired	10 (29.4)	4 (12.5)	8 (11.8)	22 (16.4)
Hearing Impaired	11 (32.4)	9 (28.1)	11 (16.2)	31 (23.1)
Orthopedically Impaired	10 (29.4)	14 (43.8)	13 (19.1)	37 (27.6)
Neurologically Impaired	5 (14.7)	5 (15.6)	12 (17.6)	22 (16.4)
Multiple Handicapped	4 (11.8)	6 (18.8)	3 (4.4)	13 (9.7)
Severely Mentally Retarded	1 (3.2)	0 (0.0)	2 (2.8)	3 (2.2)
Mildly Mentally Retarded	17 (54.8)	25 (75.8)	40 (55.6)	82 (60.3)
Moderately Mentally Retarded	5 (16.1)	8 (24.2)	14 (19.4)	27 (19.9)
Behaviorally Disabled	9 (26.5)	13 (40.6)	12 (17.6)	34 (25.4)
Learning/Language Disabled	15 (44.1)	14 (43.8)	29 (42.6)	58 (43.3)

Note: Numbers in parentheses are percentages of respondents who feel qualified to teach students with a given type of handicap.

TABLE 10

NUMBER OF NON-SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS WHO FEEL QUALIFIED TO COUNSEL SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS BY HANDICAP OF STUDENT (MAY 1977)

Handicap	Number
Visually Impaired	11 (8.2)
Hearing Impaired	15 (11.2)
Orthopedically Impaired	22 (16.4)
Neurologically Impaired	15 (11.2)
Multiple Handicapped	9 (6.7)
Severely Mentally Retarded	2 (1.5)
Mildly Mentally Retarded	49 (36.0)
Moderately Mentally Retarded	19 (14.0)
Behaviorally Disabled	28 (20.9)
Learning/Language Disabled	33 (24.6)

Note: Numbers in parentheses are percentages of respondents who feel qualified to counsel students with a given type of handicap.

APPENDIX B

SPECIAL EDUCATION IMPACT QUESTIONNAIRE

For Evaluation Office use only

1. Please estimate how many hours per month you spend on each of the following activities AS IT RELATES TO STUDENTS ENROLLED IN SPECIAL EDUCATION CLASSES.

	number of hours spent per month	please do not write in the space below.
a. discipline	_____	cc 8-9
b. counseling	_____	cc 10-11
c. parent conferences	_____	cc 12-13
d. paper work	_____	cc 14-15
e. dealing with special education administration (consultants, supervisors, etc.)	_____	cc 16-17
f. other activities (please specify)		
_____	_____	cc 18-19
_____	_____	cc 20-21

2. On the basis of your observations, to what extent do special education students mix with other students at your school? (Please check appropriate answer to both a and b.)

a. informally (e.g., during recess, lunch, coming to and from school)

_____ a lot (1)

_____ a moderate amount (2) cc 22

_____ very little (3)

_____ not at all (4)

b. formally (e.g., in assemblies, field trips, extra-curricular activities)

_____ a lot (1)

_____ a moderate amount (2) cc 23

_____ very little (3)

_____ not at all (4)

Special Education
Impact Questionnaire
Page 2

For Evaluation Office use only

3. Please indicate which (if any) of the following kinds of experience you have had in dealing with special education students. (Please check those activities that apply to you; if you check a starred activity, indicate on the line to the right what handicaps--e.g., visually impaired, mentally retarded--were involved.)

_____ have taught special education classes * _____ cc 24

_____

_____ have taught special education students in a regular classroom * _____ cc 25

_____

_____ have referred students for special education services cc 26

_____ have counseled special education students * _____ cc 27

_____

_____ have conferred with parents of special education students * _____ cc 28

_____

_____ have disciplined special education students * _____ cc 29

_____

_____ have conducted extra-curricular activities which included special education students * _____ cc 30

_____

4. (To be answered by non-special education teachers only.) Please indicate by checking which, if any, kind of special education students you feel you are qualified to teach (first column), qualified to counsel (second column), assuming that you have in-class assistance from appropriate support personnel (e.g., Braille specialists)

	teach	counsel	cc
mildly mentally retarded	_____	_____	31 32
moderately mentally retarded	_____	_____	33 34
severely mentally retarded	_____	_____	35 36

(question #4 continued page 3)

Special Education
Impact Questionnaire
Page 3

For Evaluation Office use only

4. (cont.) Check which, if any, kinds of special education students you feel you are qualified to teach and/or counsel.

	teach	counsel	cc
hearing impaired or deaf	_____	_____	37 38
visually impaired or blind	_____	_____	39 40
orthopedically handicapped	_____	_____	41 42
behaviorally disabled	_____	_____	43 44
learning/language disabled	_____	_____	45 46
neurologically impaired	_____	_____	47 48
multiply handicapped	_____	_____	49 50

5. What problems, if any, do you see that arise from the presence of special education students in your school?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Evaluation
3/77